

REMARKS

1. In response to the Office Action mailed September 24, 2007, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration. Claims 1, 5, 8-10, 12-14, and 84-138 were last presented for examination. In the outstanding Office Action, all claims have been rejected. By the foregoing Amendments, claims 1, 5, 8-10, 12-14, and 84-138 have been cancelled and new claims 139-176 have been added. No new matter has been added. Upon entry of this paper, claims 139-176 will be pending in this application. Of these 38 claims, four (4) claims (claims 139, 156, 165, and 174) are independent. Based upon the following Remarks, Applicants respectfully request that all outstanding objections and rejections be reconsidered, and that they be withdrawn.

Art of Record

2. Applicants acknowledge receipt of form PTO-892 listing additional references identified by the Examiner.

Drawings

3. Applicants thank the Examiner for accepting the drawings filed on June 25, 2007.

Objections to the Claims

4. Claims 87, 106, 109, 114-116, 124, 128 and 135-138 have been objected to because of various informalities. By the foregoing Amendments, these claims have been cancelled, making the objections to these claims moot.

New Claims

5. Applicants have cancelled all previous claims and have added new claims 139-176 for purposes of clarification. No new matter has been added. Support for the new claims is found in the originally filed specification and drawings. Specifically, support for new claims 139-176 is found in the originally filed specification line 31 on page 18 to line 35 on page 19, line 1 on page 22 to line 9 on page 24, and line 10 on page 27 to line 25 on page 28, as well as elsewhere in the specification, drawings and claims of the originally filed application.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 112, first paragraph

6. Claims 88, 89, 110, 111, 126, 127, 134, 137, and 138 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph, for failing to comply with the enablement requirement. These claims have been cancelled, making the rejections of these claims moot.

Claim rejections

7. Claims 1, 5, 8-10, 12-14, and 84-138 have been rejected under either 35 U.S.C. 102(a) or 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the various art cited, alone or in combination. These rejected claims have been cancelled, making the rejections of these claims moot.

Conclusion

8. In view of the foregoing, this application should be in condition for allowance. A notice to this effect is respectfully requested.

9. Applicants reserve the right to pursue any cancelled claims or other subject matter disclosed in this application in a continuation or divisional application, cancellations and amendments of above claims, therefore, are not to be construed as an admission regarding the patentability of any claims and Applicants reserve the right to pursue such claims in a continuation or divisional application.

Respectfully submitted,

/Michael G. Verga/

Michael G. Verga
Registration Number 39,410
CONNOLLY BOVE LODGE & HUTZ LLP
1875 Eye Street
Suite 1100
Washington, D.C. 20006
(202) 756-4358
(202) 293-6229 (FAX)

January 24, 2008

#69812v1